3

BEFORE THE HON'BLE STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL BENCH

AT RAIPUR, CHHATTISGARH

WP(S) 3799/05

Original Application No. _____/2001

Chandra Mani Khunte,
Son of Shri Lakeshwar Khunte,
Age 40 years,
Assistant Teacher,
Posted at Janpad Primary School,
Medhapali, Dabhara,
District Janjgeer-Champa (C.G.) .. Applicant

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh,
Through Secretary,
School Education Department,
Mantralaya, D.K.S.Bhawan,
Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

2. Director,
Public Instructions Chhattisgarh,
Pension Bada, Raipur.

3. District Education Officer,
District Janjgeer-Champa,
Chhattisgarh. .. Non-Applicants

APPLICATION UNDER SECTION 19 OF THE STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL ACT 1985

1. PARTICULAR OF THE APPLICANT:

As stated above in the cause title.

2. PARTICULARS OF THE NON APPLICANTS:

As stated above in the cause title.

....2

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR
W.P. (S) No. 3799 of 2005

Petitioner — Chandra Mani Khunte

Versus

Respondents — State of Chhattisgarh & others

SB: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri, J**

Shri Anupam Dubey, Advocate for the petitioner.

V. V. S. Murthy, Deputy Advocate General with Smt. Anju Ahuja, Deputy Govt. Advocate for the respondents/State.

ORDER

(Passed on this 9th day of March, 2007)

The following order of the Court is passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. The petitioner while working as Assistant Teacher in Primary School, Medhapali, Dabhara, District – Janjgir Champa was transferred to Doghadera, on the same terms and conditions vide impugned order dated 10.9.2001 (Annexure A/1).
2. The Madhya Pradesh Administrative Tribunal at Raipur vide interim order dated 22.9.2001 directed to maintain status quo in regard to the position of the petitioner as it was prevailing on 17.9.2001. By virtue of the interim order the petitioner is working at the original place of posting.
3. Be that as it may, with the passage of time this petition has become infructuous as period of transfer is not applicable forever. At this point of time there is no question to examine the validity of the transfer order. However, the respondents are at liberty to pass appropriate orders keeping in view the public interest and administrative exigency, without insisting on compliance of the impugned transfer order.
4. It is well settled principle of law that transfer is an incident of service and it is for the employer to decide as to where a particular officer/employee be posted, keeping in view public interest as well as administrative exigency. This Court has limited jurisdiction to interfere in the transfer matter and this Court can interfere only in the case of proved malafide, non-competence of authority passing the transfer order and transfer order not being in conformity with the rules and regulations.
5. In view of the above, this petition stands disposed of. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Thakur